DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 528 HE 018 486

TITLE	The Regents Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education in New York State, 1984. Volume III: Summaries of Sector Master Plans with Regents Actions.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Oct 84
NOTE	25p.; For volumes I and II, see HE 018 484-485.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; College Planning; Educational Finance; Educational Objectives; Educational Quality; *Master Plans; *Postsecondary Education; *Private Colleges; *Proprietary Schools; *State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	City University of New York; *New York; Public Colleges; State University of New York

ABSTRACT

The master plans of New York public and private sectors are summarized in this third volume of the Regents' state plan for the development of postsecondary education in New York State. Attention is directed to the recommendations of each sector and the regents' responses/actions. The City University of New York's 1984 master plan proposes increasing or improving student financial aid, student support systems, library resources, and scientific equipment and facilities. The twenty-five recommendations of the independent sector concern quality, access, efficient use of resources, and diversity. Recommendations of the State University of New York's 1984 master plan and regents' actions cover the following topics: mission priorities, academic programs, research, public service, the enrollment plan, capital facilities, and fiscal issues. A summary of the 1984 master plans of 28 proprietary degree-granting institutions, which was prepared by the Association of Private Degree-Granting Institutions, is also provided. Included are eight goals of proprietary institutions and objectives for achieving the goals. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258528

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE REGENTS STATEWIDE PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN NEW YORK STATE, 1984

Volume III
Summaries of Sector Master Plans with Regents Actions

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

New York State Education Dept.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Albany, New York 12230
October 1984

HE018486

THE REGENTS STATEWIDE PLAN
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
IN NEW YORK STATE
1984

Volume III

Summaries of Sector Master Plans with Regents Actions

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, or sex in the educational programs and activities which it operates. Inquiries concerning this policy of equal opportunity and affirmative action should be referred to the Department's Affirmative Action Officer, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234. Phone (518) 473-1265.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Albany, New York 12230

October 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University *(with years when terms expire)*

1988	WILLARD A. GENRICH, *Chancellor,* LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D., Litt.D., D.C.S., D.C.L., Sc.D.	Buffalo
1987	MARTIN C. BARELL, *Vice Chancellor,* B.A., I.A., LL.B., LL.D.	Muttontown
1986	KENNETH B. CLARK, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc.	Hastings on Hudson
1989	EMLYN I. GRIFFITH, A.B., J.D.	Rome
1991	JORGE L. BATISTA, B.A., J.D., LL.D.	Bronx
1986	LAURA BRADLEY CHODOS, B.A., M.A.	Vischer Ferry
1991	LOUISE P. MATTEONI, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Bayside
1988	J. EDWARD MEYER, B.A., LL.B., L.H.D.	Chappaqua
1987	R. CARLOS CARBALLADA, B.S., L.H.D., D.Sc.	Rochester
1988	FLOYD S. LINTON, A.B., M.A., M.P.A., D.C.L., LL.D.	Miller Place
1988	SALVATORE J. SCLAFANI, B.S., M.D.	Staten Island
1989	MIMI LIEBER, B.A., M.A.	Manhattan
1985	SHIRLEY C. BROWN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Albany
1990	ROBERT M. BEST, B.S.	Binghamton
1990	NORMA GLUCK, B.A., M.S.W., LL.D.	Manhattan
1990	THOMAS R. FREY, A.B., LL.B.	Rochester

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
GORDON M. AMBACH

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
ROBERT J. MAURER

Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education
DONALD J. NOLAN

Assistant Commissioner for Postsecondary Policy Analysis
HEIDI L. MAHONEY

Director, Bureau of Finance and Facilities Studies
THOMAS A. FLOOD

Chief, Bureau of Postsecondary Planning
BYRON P. CONNELL

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of the "1984 Master Plan" of The City University of New York, with Regents Action	1
Summary of the Recommendations of the Independent Sector, with Regents Actions	4
Summary of "The Responsive University: Recommendations of the State University of New York for the 1980's," the 1984 master plan of the State University of New York, with Regents Actions	10
Summary of "The Summary of the 1984 Master Plans of Proprietary Degree-Granting Institutions" prepared by the Association of Private Degree-Granting Institutions, with Regents Actions	15

THE REGENTS STATEWIDE PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN NEW YORK STATE

Volume III

Summaries of Sector Master Plans with Regents Actions

This volume of the Statewide Plan summarizes "The 1984 Master Plan" of The City University of New York, the Recommendations of the Independent Sector, "The Responsive University: Recommendations of the State University of New York for the 1980's," and "The Summary of the 1984 Master Plans of Proprietary Degree-Granting Institutions," together with actions on them taken by the Regents. To the extent indicated in this volume, each is incorporated into the Regents Statewide Plan.

Volume I of this Plan sets forth the Regents proposals for action, and their recommendations to the Governor, to address the most critical issues confronting higher education in New York State. Volume II examines those issues in detail and provides information in support of the Regents proposals.

THE 1984 MASTER PLAN OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

In January 1984, the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York adopted its "1984 Master Plan." The City University master plan does not make specific recommendations, but does set forth four principal aims; they are described below. Except with respect to the projections of enrollments in the CUNY master plan, the Regents approve the "1984 Master Plan" of The City University of New York and incorporate it into the Statewide Plan. In so doing, the Regents do not waive any requirement for approval of individual master plan amendments with respect to any matters in the City University master plan that may require such action.

In the introduction to the master plan, the Chancellor of the City University states the "intention to provide the people of New York with access to a University distinguished academically and dedicated to the principle that higher education is the single most powerful instrument of personal advancement in our society." The University is determined, according to the Chancellor, to maintain excellence in the quality of academic offerings, while keeping faith with a commitment to equal access for the diverse racial and ethnic population of New York City. The Chancellor stated that these two goals — excellence and access — bind together the master plan as well as the University community. However, according to the Chancellor, the University's ability to fulfill them will be determined as much by the level of support it draws to its cause as by the University's resolve. The Chancellor asks for support to assure the quality of existing programs, to enhance the retention of students at the University, to provide tuition assistance to part-time students, and to lend the University's help in strengthening the City's elementary and secondary schools.

The City University master plan focuses on six main issues to be resolved in the next four years: (1) "the development of partnerships and alliances between the University and the non-academic community in New York City, particularly business and labor," (2) "the commitment of the University's personnel, training, and research to the problems of public elementary and secondary schooling;" (3) "the University's need to provide basic skills instruction to its students;" (4) "the strategies the University will devise to increase the rate of retention of its students;" (5) "the need to provide tuition relief to part-time students at the University;" and (6) "the need to better community college-senior college articulation within the University." The master plan also reports on the current status of existing and planned physical facilities for the University's campuses; projects the University's headcount enrollment, by college, through 1992; sets forth brief statements of the mission of each college; and provides certain current data on degrees, faculty, revenues and expenditures, capital costs, and basic student charges.

The University states that it has established a variety of agreements with New York City agencies, businesses, and labor unions to provide educational programs for the City's workers. For example, The College of Staten Island offers an associate degree program in cooperation with the Health and Hospitals Corporation for licensed practical nurses and a program to upgrade the skills of District Council 37 (AFSCME) secretaries who work in public agencies, and York College offers a training program in language and mathematical skills for employees of the New York Telephone Company. The University plans, in the next four years, to expand ties with the business community in order to coordinate research programs in technology and the physical and life sciences with the research and development needs of industry, and to assure that the University's training programs are compatible with the needs of local industry.

City University is committed to improving New York City public schools. The University produces the majority of the public school system's teachers, graduating 900 baccalaureate degree and 1,200 master's degree level teachers from its 300 registered degree programs in education every year. The University states that its commitment to improving public schooling extends beyond the training of teachers, however. City University has established over 100 collaborative programs that now link the University with 350 New York City public schools. The University also sponsors, in conjunction with the New York City Board of Education, campus schools designed to provide an alternative educational experience in a campus environment. The University sponsors research centers designed to address issues affecting schooling in New York City, and the University sponsors inter-institutional collaborative efforts, such as the New York Alliance for the Public Schools.

During the next four years, the City University states that it plans to integrate its educational research, teacher training, and outreach efforts to produce a well-defined program to improve the City's schools. The University will assess its capacity to train teachers in sufficient numbers and quality to meet manpower needs. It will employ faculty research skills to help public schools analyze the quality of existing elementary and secondary programs and to suggest new strategies to educate students in the basic skills. The University also states that it will seek to curb high

school drop-out rates by employing University undergraduates as tutors and mentors throughout the City's public school system.

The City University master plan states that, although basic skills instruction is important at all universities, it is especially important at an institution with a policy of open access. The University cites its leadership role in the fields of basic writing, basic mathematics, reading, and English as a second language. City University reports that it has established computer-assisted remedial programs, programs to train full-time and adjunct faculty in basic skills instruction, and programs to articulate basic writing programs with the writing students perform in other courses. It states that additional funding is needed in order to purchase computers for instructional purposes and to retrain full-time faculty and hire adjunct faculty to teach in remedial programs.

The University says that the issue of student retention is of particular concern to City University because its commitment to open access entails an obligation to help students who are academically, economically, or socially disadvantaged to realize their goal of achieving a college education. It points out that the greatest cost of attrition is to the student who is unable to complete a program of study. However, there are institutional costs, including a direct loss of tuition revenue, loss of government funding, and a general undermining of morale and campus diversity. The plan notes that a University-wide Task Force on Student Retention and Academic Progress is developing strategies to reduce student attrition.

According to the City University master plan, "No public policy is more important to retaining access, excellence, and choice in New York State's public higher education system than the maintenance of the lowest possible tuition level. A necessary corollary of low tuition is a comprehensive system of tuition assistance for students unable to meet even modestly priced tuition." The City University advocates a program of tuition assistance for part-time students. Such a program, according to the University, would increase enrollment and retention, spur growth in adult and continuing education programs, and encourage the retraining of workers in response to the technological changes in our work force. The University also points to restrictive income limits that cause many full-time students, classified as single, to lose financial aid.

The University states that over the last 12 years its Board of Trustees has initiated policies to promote the educational mobility of community college students. Each graduate of a City University community college is guaranteed a place in one of the system's senior colleges. The 64 credits earned in an associate degree program are counted towards the baccalaureate degree. The CUNY Board of Trustees has also placed limits on the number of credits a senior college may require of community college graduates transferring to parallel programs. During the next four years, the central administration plans to initiate two projects designed to improve articulation within the system. One, the Course Equivalency Project, will evaluate community college courses for their equivalence to senior college courses. The other, a transfer study (which is contingent on grant support), will trace the experiences of a group of transfer students who move from associate degree to baccalaureate degree programs within the City University. The goal is to better understand the problems encountered by transfer students and to provide a base of information for future activities designed to improve the academic performance of transfer students.

The master plan of the City University sets forth four major aims. The first aim is "To provide a comprehensive student financial aid system which includes part-time students and emancipated students." The University states that in order to be accountable to the urban constituencies of the City, it must be accessible to nontraditional students. It points out that about 51,000 students enrolled in CUNY programs are at the same time full-time workers, that 25,000 are single parents, and that 59,000 are independent students. However, the University reports that many of these students are ineligible for the comprehensive financial aid benefits available to traditional, full-time students.

The second aim is "To develop viable student support systems which respond to the unique character of the University's student body." The plan points out that, as an open access institution, City University must assure adequate support services for students who are academically, economically, and socially disadvantaged. It states that support services in the areas of counseling, academic advisement, orientation, child care, and remediation are crucial to the success of its students. However, according to the University, these support programs are "woefully underfunded or nonexistent." The University is seeking adequate funding for student support services.

The third aim is "To revitalize library resources throughout The City University." According to the University, library holdings and the delivery of services have been rendered inadequate by financial cutbacks. A Chancellor's Task Force on Libraries has recommended a program to develop a unified library system, in which the college libraries retain local autonomy and the University seeks funds for University-wide programs. Under the system, resource sharing and collection development programs would be devel-

oped to reduce unnecessary duplication of resources. The University states that the automated Union Catalog System will continue to be expanded to reduce cataloging costs. According to City University, additional funding is critically needed for library resources.

The fourth aim stated in the City University master plan is "To improve scientific equipment and facilities at every City University campus." The plan states that, according to a 1980 task force study, nearly all colleges in the University lacked specialized facilities necessary for advanced technical programs and many lacked even the basic instruments needed for standard science courses. The University points to inadequate financial resources as the cause for this situation and calls for a major University-wide effort to improve scientific facilities and equipment at all of its campuses.

City University projects its total headcount enrollment (revised projection of May 31, 1984) to grow from 182,065 students in the fall of 1983 to 197,329 in the fall of 1988, an increase of less than three percent. By the fall of 1992, the University projects that its total headcount enrollment will be in the range of 186,604 to 192,225 students. Between the fall of 1982 and 1988, the University projects headcount enrollment at the senior colleges (including the Graduate School and the School of Law) to grow by about 1.7 percent, from 126,049 to 128,152; in the fall of 1992 it is projected by the University to be in the range of 127,021 to 130,787 students. For its community colleges, City University projects a greater growth rate — almost six percent — between the fall of 1983 headcount enrollment of 56,016 students and the fall 1988 projection of 59,177. For the fall of 1992, City University projects community college enrollments to be in the range of 59,583 to 61,438 headcount students.

Regents action: Except with respect to the projections of enrollments in the CUNY master plan, the Regents approve the "1984 Master Plan" of The City University of New York and incorporate it into the Statewide Plan. The enrollments projected by City University are significantly higher than the enrollments projected by the Regents for City University in this Statewide Plan. For 1988, CUNY's enrollment projection ranges from almost 5,000 to more than 15,000 students higher than the range projected by the Regents (171,990 to 182,610). For 1992, the difference ranges from over 13,000 to over 20,000 students more than the Regents project (164,730 to 178,470). Therefore, the Regents substitute the projections for City University they have set forth in the chapter on Enrollment Projections in Volume II of this Statewide Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

The Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities submitted consolidated tables of data and projections provided in the individual master plans of independent colleges and universities, summaries of the responses in those plans to the questions posed in The Bulletin of the Regents Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education, 1984, and 25 recommendations to the Regents under the headings of Quality, Access, Efficient Use of Resources, and Diversity. Those recommendations, together with the Regents responses to them, are set forth below.

QUALITY

The commission points out that "The lack of up-to-date scientific and technical equipment is one of the most urgent problems facing postsecondary education," and recommends:

1. The State Education Department should recommend incentives to provide state funding for replacement and acquisition of scientific and technical equipment vital to New York's competitive educational and industrial capability.

   Regents action: Approved.

To address "the persistent gap between the skills students are provided by New York's educational institutions and the expectations from business and industry; the gap between the skills students are provided by our elementary and secondary schools and the expectations of New York's colleges and universities; and the need to upgrade and enhance teacher education at the undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education levels," CICU recommends:

2. The Regents should establish regional educational councils composed of representatives from elementary, secondary and postsecondary levels with business, industry, labor and civic leaders to work together to improve K-12 curricula, and teacher education and teaching conditions to enhance learning at the elementary and secondary levels.

   Regents action: Approved in principle. The Department has established regional councils composed of representatives of higher education institutions and school districts. Consideration will be given to expanding their membership to include business, industry, labor, and civic leaders.

The Commission points out that computers "can be used to widen the dimensions and improve the quality of teaching and learning," but that "teacher access to new innovations are often limited to individuals seeking out each manufacturer and assessing the quality and availability of computer hardware and software." It calls on the Regents to "authorize the compilation and publication of a new learning technologies catalog of available hardware, software and courseware to help guide elementary, secondary and postsecondary curricular architects," and recommends:

3. The Regents and the State Education Department should help colleges and universities transform the results of campus research and institutional studies to assist with the revision of curricula in the arts and humanities, integrated with alternate instruction techniques including the use of computer technology.

   Regents action: Approved.

CICU points out that "Efforts to gain flexibility in staffing, to facilitate the flow of young faculty, minorities and women into postsecondary teaching and administrative professions have been thwarted by high tenure ratios and a change in the mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70...." It seeks "a printed compilation of successful programs, such as early retirement plans, part-time employment and revolving sabbaticals, geared to reducing the impact of tenure and retirement on recruitment and hiring flexibility," and recommends:

4. The Commissioner of Education should appoint a task force of higher education experts to develop options for the improvement of campus flexibility and advancement of personnel including women and minorities.

   Regents action: Approved in principle. The Regents are committed to the expansion of opportunities for women and members of minority groups to enter postsecondary teaching and administration, advance in faculty and administrative ranks, and earn tenure as faculty. However, they need to give further study to the flexibility of the task force approach proposed.

Noting that New York's collections of 18th and 19th century documents are endangered, "due to handling, unfavorable environmental conditions and the use of high acid content paper," CICU recommends:

5. The Regents should develop a plan of action to preserve and conserve valuable, historic 18th and 19th century library collections.

Regents action: Approved. The Regents understand that similar efforts are needed with respect to late 19th and early 20th century documents because of the high acid content of the paper on which they were printed.

Because of declines in library purchasing power and the need to "protect the accessibility of New York's high quality library resources for as many institutions and state residents as possible," the Commission recommends:

6. The Regents should review the current support of the New York interlibrary lending system.

Regents action: Approved.

CICU points out that "The most effective library information systems require modern computing systems. Maximum use of available bibliographic resources requires compatible automation of our libraries and an effective statewide delivery system." It recommends:

7. The State Education Department, in cooperation with the State University, City University and the independent institutions of the University of the State of New York, should provide the opportunity for additional postsecondary institutions to participate in the computerized State University On-line College Library Center (SUNY-OCLC).

Regents action: Approved in principle. SUNY/OCLC includes SUNY, CUNY, and independent college libraries among its members. The Regents strongly endorse academic library networking efforts and urge college libraries that do not now participate in them to do so. However, the Regents cannot "provide the opportunity" in any other way.

ACCESS

According to CICU, "Currently, there is no sequential periodical distributed to inform and update high school students and their parents about the resources available to finance a college education," and "A similar situation exists in admissions." Therefore, CICU recommends:

8. The State Education Department should provide a series of sequential college admission and financial aid bulletins to high school students and their parents to serve as a 9th through 12th grade guide to the selection and financing of a college education.

Regents action: Defer. Action on this recommendation is deferred pending consultation with higher education institutions, secondary schools, and the Higher Education Services Corporation.

CICU states that "High School students and their parents have access to incomplete information" concerning the offerings of New York's degree-granting institutions, "in the form of commercially published indices or individual sector guides. Linking high school computer terminals to the SED computer bank would give guidance counselors and students complete and accurate data for New York State's entire system of postsecondary education." The Commission recommends:

9. The State Education Department should provide all high schools in New York State with daily telecommunications access via computer terminals with the Department's data bank of registered programs.

Regents action: Approved in principle. The Department successfully uses computer terminals to provide its College Curriculum Information Service at college fairs in the State. However, the cost of the effort proposed by CICU needs to be examined in light of available resources.

Noting that "It is difficult for parents and students to grasp the concepts of uniform methodology, family contribution, and financial need," for student financial aid, CICU recommends:

10. The State Education Department (SED) should provide a computer software program for the computation of financial aid need analysis to every college and university in New York to offer prospective students an accurate and realistic example of their financial aid packages at particular institutions.

Regents action: Defer. Action on this recommendation is deferred pending consultation with higher education institutions and the Higher Education Services Corporation.

The Commission points out that the variety of annual college admission and student aid workshops for guidance counselors is uneven in quality and in distribution across the State. "New York State has vast resources in its professional and sector-based admissions and financial aid organizations. No region of the state

should lack access to these resources, and certainly there should be no systematic miscommunication of information." CICU recommends:

11. The State Education Department should coordinate with the Higher Education Services Corporation, the New York State Financial Aid Administrator's Association and the central admissions offices of each sector of the University of the State of New York (USNY) to offer one annual admissions and financial aid workshop for high school guidance counselors in each region of the state.

    Regents action: Approved in principle. Consultation with the other proposed parties is needed.

Pointing out that "There is no periodic publication for the high school guidance counselor which relays financial aid changes as they occur," CICU recommends:

12. The State Education Department and the Higher Education Services Corporation should coordinate, with each sector of USNY and with the New York State Financial Aid Administrators Association, a series of communication updates for guidance counselors to inform them of new developments in college academic and financial aid programs.

    Regents action: Approved in principle. The Regents certainly agree that appropriate and current information on student aid should be disseminated to the secondary schools. The Department now undertakes the publication of limited financial aid bulletins. However, consultation with the other proposed parties is needed on the effort recommended.

CICU notes that the State's special opportunity programs (SEEK, HEOP, EOP, CD) were established to remedy "Significant discrepancies in the college-going and retention rates among blacks, hispanics, other minorities and whites..." and that the academic services, financial aid, and support services they offer, "when provided together, have been found to correlate significantly with academic success for disenfranchised students." The Commission recommends:

13. The State Education Department should review its current special opportunity programs to determine which are the most academically and fiscally effective, if any are underfunded and if more assistance is warranted in regions where significant college-going and college retention disparities exist.

    Regents action: Approved.

Pointing out that "There is significant underrepresentation of minorities in the licensed professions in New York State," the Commission recommends:

14. The Regents should recommend additional programs for minority access to the natural science, engineering and graduate professions with adequate funding based on proven successful programs of this type, spanning all three levels of education.

    Regents action: Approved.

"With the wide diversity of campus environments and program offerings in New York State, our current net export of college students should be decreased. Indeed, a significant import of students is attainable." Therefore, CICU recommends:

15. The Regents and the Department of Commerce should commission an information/marketing campaign showcasing the state's diversity and excellence of higher education to encourage New York State students to continue their education in their home state and to attract out-of-state foreign students to our colleges.

    Regents action: Approved in principle. This recommendation is responsive to one of the objectives set by the Regents, and accepted by the Governor, in the 1980 Statewide Plan. In prior years, the Regents have sought funding for such efforts. Consultation with the Department of Commerce is needed on this recommendation.

CICU argues that "New York State's most productive tax resource is its business and industry. To make this state increasingly attractive to business and industry, a major effort should be made to establish contract courses between all sectors of USNY and business and industry. Creating added opportunities for in-service and pre-service education through the independent sector of USNY will make the state a more attractive workplace.

"The State should provide tax levy support of all colleges and universities for students enrolled in contract courses designed by private corporations to meet specific occupational training needs." CICU recommends:

16. The State Education Department should encourage contract courses between all sectors of higher education and business and industry to provide pre-service and in-service training for adult students.

Regents action: Approved in principle. The Regents encourage all colleges and universities to contribute to meeting the needs of business and industry. State aid to independent colleges to help defray the cost of contract courses would require legislation, however. One important criterion for such a program must be that it helps to reduce the cost of such courses to the contracting businesses.

The Commission states that "Failure to annually adjust the state's student financial aid programs to achieve a balance in relation to the price students and parents pay to attend college results in high unmet need and accumulated debt." It recommends:

17. The Regents should reaffirm their 1972 Master Plan recommendation that the Legislature annually adjust the state's program of student financial aid to achieve an adequate level of support in relation to the price students and parents must pay to attend colleges of their choice.

    Regents action: Approved in principle. The Regents support periodic adjustments in student aid. The Department annually reviews the effectiveness of the State's student aid programs, and the Regents propose adjustments if warranted. Annual adjustments in student aid programs may be unwarranted, and adjustments should be derived from current circumstances and trends.

To "Establish a planned, predictable relationship between tuition rates (in the public sectors) and educational costs...," the Commission recommends:

18. The Regents should reaffirm their 1972 Master Plan recommendation that the public institutions of the University of the State of New York should establish a more rational tuition policy which considers the cost of the education provided and the student's ability to pay.

    Regents action: Disapproved. Elsewhere in this Plan, the Regents have called upon the public sectors to define more specifically their tuition policies. It is most appropriate for SUNY and CUNY to address this issue at this time without the restraints implied in this recommendation.

"The use of indexing to determine a level of state aid to independent postsecondary institutions was first suggested in New York in the mid-1970s. There is renewed interest in the concept in the 1980s. Indexing means tying aid for independent colleges to a specific factor, or set of factors, derived from the state's funding of its public colleges." CICU recommends:

19. The Regents should reaffirm their 1976 Master Plan recommendation that the overall level of state funding for independent institutions be based on the standard cost per student of public institutions.

    Regents action: Defer. The Regents encourage efforts to examine current funding formulae for postsecondary education and to develop alternative methods which are best suited to respond to the needs of higher education in the 1980's and 90's. Until a comprehensive study of funding formulae has been undertaken and completed, the Regents cannot support any one approach to this issue.

EFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES

"To monitor the relative state funding for all sectors of USNY," CICU recommends:

20. To assure public policy decisions based on most efficient use of resources the Regents should provide for annual reporting of:
    a. State and local tax levy support, by sectors
    — per FTE student (resident, non-resident, and total)
    — per FTE student by degree programs
    — by instructional and non-instructional services per FTE student
    — by degree awarded
    b. In-state, out-of-state tuition charges, by sector and degree level.
    c. Relative compensation of academic personnel.
    d. The impact of higher education collective bargaining settlements on the distribution of state tax levy funds.
    e. Resource flows to New York higher education institutions
    — indicating tuition as a percentage of total operating costs
    — philanthropic support
    — government grants
    — income from industry and business research and training contracts

    Regents action: Approved in principle. This is subject to the availability of resources and data, and to the cost to institutions of providing data. For example, the comparisons proposed under (a), above, would require independent

institutions to track and report Bundy aid and student aid by program and by object of expenditure. Since Bundy aid is unrestricted, and need not be spent according to the programs for which it is apportioned, such information is not now gathered from independent colleges. Several of the categories proposed under (e), above, are not among the standard fiscal reporting categories in the HEDS/HEGIS system, for example, "income from industry and business research and training contracts."

"The problems of institutional management, and intense financial and organizational pressures that characterize the modern campus, often push cooperation with other institutions to a low priority. Although cooperation as an ideal is generally supported, it is infrequently realized. Existing incentives are not great enough to override the pressing concerns of day-to-day management." CICU recommends:

21. The Regents should provide incentives (i.e., funding for joint planning, consortium arrangements and combined development grants for inter-institutional cooperative ventures to avoid redundancies of program offerings, needless investments in staff, equipment and facilities.

    Regents action: Approved. The Regents are committed to seeking legislation for such purposes.

"The Business-Higher Education Forum of the American Council on Education (ACE) has made strong recommendations to improve industry-university initiatives: 'Working together, business and universities can pool talents and resources to accomplish what they could not achieve working independently. Potential benefits include the more expeditious transfer of research results to commercialization and the education of students on subjects relevant to industrial needs.'

"Before we can expect meaningful progress toward this goal, we must provide business and industry with a description of the resources available." CICU recommends:

22. To maximize existing resources, the Regents, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and the Science and Technology Foundation, should biennially report on USNY's inventory of faculty expertise; equipment and facilities capable of industrial and government research projects; and non-degree manpower training capabilities.

    Regents action: Approved in principle. It would be extraordinarily difficult for institutions to provide some of this information.

DIVERSITY

According to the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities, "Historic access and choice levels achieved through New York State public policy under the guidance of the Regents has been seriously eroded by the combination of the increased cost of providing education, increased student and parent debt to meet the price of attendance, and the failure of public policy to maintain funding levels established at the onset of direct institutional and student loan programs. These factors have resulted in extraordinary burdens on independent institutions for unfunded student aid." CICU recommends:

23. The Regents and the State Education Department should develop a better understanding among policymakers of the educational value and fiscal prudence of maintaining a truly diverse and accessible postsecondary system.

    Regents action: Approved. The higher education enterprise in New York today expends over $6 billion, of which about $2 billion is provided from State tax-levy funds, including student aid. This action does not include approval of CICU's proposal that "The Regents should include in their 1984 Master Plan, submitted to the Governor and the Legislature, an assessment of the impact of these issues and trends on the Regent's goals for postsecondary education."

CICU states that "The direct institutional aid program has been critical to maintaining the financial viability of New York's independent colleges and universities," and that "The direct institutional aid program is a vital element in holding down the New York tax payer's burden for higher education while assuring a system of higher education quality and broad access." It recommends:

24. The Regents should recommend periodic increases in the independent sector's direct institutional aid program so that it continues to represent the same proportion of independent institution's operating budgets as it did when the program was established in 1968.

    Regents action: Disapproved. The Regents strongly support the maintenance of Bundy aid through periodic adjustments to the schedule,

as warranted. However, such adjustments must be based on the review of many significant factors relating to State support for independent institutions.

"Recognizing that we are part of a highly interdependent world, we believe that higher education has a basic responsibility to ensure that future graduates are able to deal with the dynamics of such world interdependence." The Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities recommends:

25. The Regents should vigorously pursue the development of expanded international education programs as recommended in their 1984 Postsecondary Master Planning bulletin.

Regents action: Approved.

THE 1984 MASTER PLAN OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

The State University's 1984 master plan, entitled "The Responsive University: Recommendations of the State University of New York for the 1980's," was adopted by the State University Trustees in January 1984. It defines the general mission of education as threefold: creating an informed, politically responsible electorate; contributing to economic prosperity by increasing individual productivity and by stimulating the development of new goods and services; and sharpening understanding of the issues of the day. Within this general mission, the plan sees the mission of public higher education as unique in two respects: first, it "offers its benefits to all who can profitably make use of them"; and second, it "is directly answerable to the society at large. Supported by public funds, it has a mandate to deploy its resources in pursuit of the public good," in instruction, research, and public service.

Except as explicitly noted below with respect to recommendations #14 and 15, recommendations #16, 17, 18, and 19, on which we take no action, and recommendation #21, on which we defer action, the Regents approve the 1984 master plan of the State University of New York and, to the extent appropriate, incorporate it into this Statewide Plan. In approving this 1984 master plan of the State University, the Regents do not waive any requirement for approval of individual master plan amendments with respect to any matters in the State University master plan that may require such action.

In the following review, each topic in the State University master plan is addressed, and specific action is taken on each formal recommendation.

The introduction to the plan is entitled, "Preamble: Public Higher Education in the 1980's." It identifies three major issues as the most urgent ones facing the State University and its constituencies during the 1980's:

1) *Enrollment and Student Body Composition:* The State's pool of high school graduates will shrink by nearly 40 percent by the mid-1990's. Increased participation by older adults, part-time students, and minorities is expected to offset this decrease, but to an unknown extent. Further, these nontraditional students will require "new kinds of learning formats and support services."

2) *Governance and Accountability*: The plan calls for a "creative reconciliation" of the State University's basic needs, as a public institution, to respond to public policy, and as an academy of higher learning, to preserve organizational autonomy needed for freedom of inquiry and intellectual integrity.

3) *State Economic Priorities*: the plan notes that in a period of "increased competition for available tax dollars," policymakers must allocate judiciously among such purposes as public higher education, other State functions such as social services and corrections, infrastructure maintenance, and assistance to independent colleges and universities.

Noting that State University has established a reputation as a locus of opportunity, academic strength, research, and economic growth, the introduction to the State University's master plan concludes: "After extraordinary growth during the 1960's and early 1970's, SUNY is finding the present decade one of consolidation and refinement." The introduction concludes with a call for the State to "protect SUNY's capacity to meet emerging needs speedily, effectively, and with the full range of resources necessary for success."

The State University master plan makes 22 formal recommendations, ranged under nine topics: The State University of New York: A System; Mission Priorities; Academic Programs; Campus Directions; Research; Public Service; The Enrollment Plan; Capital Facilities; and Fiscal Issues.

The State University of New York: A System

This section reviews the diversity of SUNY's 64 campuses and 3,000 academic programs. For the remainder of the 1980's, State University will stress its "systems" approach, for example, by means of "joint, combined, and cooperative programming" among SUNY units. SUNY's participation in joint efforts with other sectors is also noted: for example, with City University, the work of the SUNY/CUNY Task Force on Teacher Education; with independent institutions, in research efforts such as Centers for Advanced Technology and in regional consortia; and with all postsecondary institutions in the State, in the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York (ACUSNY). This section includes two recommendations:

#1. The University will continue to explore and implement all valid alternatives for the effective use of its resources.

Regents action: Approved.

#2. The University, while recognizing the legitimate concerns of other state agencies, will continue to seek greater administrative flexibility in order to increase its managerial effectiveness.

Regents action: Approved.

Mission Priorities

These are 12 in number. Under *Opportunity to Enter the System*, the plan states that this priority has been addressed in recent years through a number of policies and programs, including Full Opportunity Programs at the community colleges, geographic distribution of programs permitting most students to pursue their chosen course of study near home, articulation and transfer between two-year and four-year or upper-division programs, the Educational Opportunity Program and Educational Opportunity Centers, and the activities of the SUNY Center for Access Services. *Academic Quality* is another priority; here the plan notes the internal review process under which each campus completes a comprehensive review of undergraduate programs every five years, according to standards of quality, need, efficiency, and interrelationships. Graduate programs are similarly reviewed by the campuses on a five-year schedule. Accreditation by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools also serves to strengthen academic quality. The plan notes the recent emergence of "outcome standards" as a measure of academic quality. It notes, further, that "fiscal constraints imposed within the past several years have threatened the quality of many SUNY programs," and that enhanced staffing and support, as well as efficient use of resources, will be needed in order to sustain academic quality. The plan notes the importance of *Student Support Services* such as recreational activities, athletics, the performing arts, governance, advisement and counseling, library and other resources, and residence services.

Several of the mission priorities have to do with particular types of curricula or programs. *General Education* addresses the redefinition and revision of academic requirements and core curricula at SUNY campuses. By evaluating the results of curricular reform, the University is providing for future revisions necessary to attain campuses' objectives. Under *Engineering and the Engineering Technologies*, the plan refers to State University's January 1982 report, "Investment Needs: Engineering and the Engineering Technologies," which outlined initiatives proposed by State University to respond to posited shortages of engineering personnel in certain areas of the State. In *Technical Education*, the plan states that the University will continue to give high priority to two-year programs preparing students for immediate employment. Regarding *Teacher Education*, SUNY is establishing a task force to examine admissions requirements and curricular changes for teacher education programs; educational research; and relationships between campus training programs and New York's K-12 school systems. In *Graduate Education*, the University will encourage new graduate programs that expand its capacities for research, development, and meeting the needs of an older, better educated population for continuing education for professionals, retraining, and personal enrichment. In the *Health Sciences*, recent developments are cited, such as the growth of the hospital and medical school at Stony Brook, the maturing of the Binghamton Clinical Campus, and plans for the development of a similar clinical campus in Queens. State University notes the importance of support for the costs of University medical services, as well as the costs of medical training. This includes the cost of health care assistance provided by the University at such State residential facilities as prisons and mental health/developmental disabilities centers.

With regard to *International Programs*, the University will strengthen existing programs, broaden international elements in its regular curricula, and strengthen its offerings in foreign languages and area studies. *Lifelong Learning* and *Affirmative Action* are the last two mission priorities.

In this section, the plan makes the following seven recommendations:

#3. The University will continue to develop effective means of supporting minority enrollment on its campuses, particularly in academic programs where minorities are underrepresented.

Regents action: Approved.

#4. The University will continue to maintain the high quality of its academic programs — undergraduate, graduate, and professional — and will monitor this effort through continuation of internal campus reviews and the accreditation reviews conducted by the appropriate voluntary agencies and professional associations.

Regents action: Approved.

#5. The University, to maintain its standards of academic excellence, will strive for a balance between resources and needs in catego-

ries of staffing and support most directly affecting program quality.

Regents action: Approved. The Regents commend the State University for its emphasis upon academic quality as a top priority.

#6. The University will strive to maximize the resources it collects for the patient care provided by its three University hospitals and three University clinics.

Regents action: Approved.

#7. The University will work with state government and its agencies to develop better procedures for providing care and services in the state correctional facilities and in the state mental institutions.

Regents action: Approved.

#8. The University will continue to identify and respond to lifelong needs for learning, making use of cooperative arrangements among campuses and with other agencies to provide quality educational offerings in the most cost-efficient manner.

Regents action: Approved.

#9. The University will continue its efforts to increase employment opportunities for women, minorities, and the handicapped.

Regents action: Approved.

Academic Programs

In this section, the State University master plan describes the relative levels of instructional activity, measured by student full-time equivalent workload, by type of campus and by discipline area. In the aggregate, at State-operated campuses the greatest activity in undergraduate instruction was in social sciences, letters, mathematics, physical sciences, education, and fine and applied arts. In graduate education, the greatest activity was in education. Compared with the profile for the fall of 1979, the 1982 profile suggests increased undergraduate interest in technical fields such as computer and information sciences, communications, and engineering. No recommendations are included in this section.

Campus Directions

This section describes program emphases at each of the University's campuses. No recommendations are included.

Research

The plan states that the three goals for University research in its 1980 master plan are still pertinent: (1) increasing external support for SUNY research; (2) enhancing research productivity, primarily via multidisciplinary and multi-campus cooperation; and (3) linking University research capacities to those of New York State's industrial and high technology community. The plan notes, however, that progress toward these goals has been impeded by 1981-1982 declines in Federal research funding (recently restored) and by inadequacies in the University's available scientific equipment (which it will strive to redress). State University plans to stimulate the search for external funding with a computerized information system for research funding opportunities. In addition, it has established an industrial liaison program within the Office of Technology Transfer, in the State University Research Foundation. SUNY units also participate in the New York State Centers for Advanced Technology program. In all, University research supported by industry has increased markedly in the past three years, according to the State University master plan.

In this section, the State University plan makes the following two recommendations:

#10. The University will continue to invest in equipment, facilities, and staff to strengthen its capacity for basic research and research related to economic development in New York State.

Regents action: Approved.

#11. The University will contiue to review its policies such as those on extra service compensation, use of equipment and facilities, continuing education, and patents and copyright, modifying them as necessary to encourage constructive University-industry research partnerships.

Regents action: Approved.

Public Service

This section outlines the University's efforts:

— to offer services to business and industry through 59 public service offices, 28 Develop-

ment Centers for Business, six Small Business Institutes, and a growing number of Technical Assistance Centers;

— to cooperate with such organizations as local development agencies, unions, and Federal agencies; and

— to train and retrain the State's work force.

The following two recommendations are included:

#12. The University will continue to apply its instructional, research, and technical assistance resources to public needs, in cooperation with business, industry, labor, state and local government, community agencies, and other sectors of education.

Regents action: Approved.

#13. The University will continue to seek alternate funding to enable its campuses to offer special training and retraining not currently available to the state work force.

Regents action: Approved.

The Enrollment Plan

State University anticipates some decline in full-time equivalent enrollments, leveling off in the latter years of this master plan and resulting in a different mix of full-time and part-time students from the current one. This section points out the variables affecting enrollment, including the declining number of high school graduates, increasing number of older adults, increasing proportion of minority groups in the State's population, costs of education, and student financial aid. During the next four years, SUNY will adopt an automated enrollment projection system. The projections in this plan assume no major changes in social patterns, economic conditions, or public policy on higher education. These projections form the following two recommendations:

#14. The University estimates the following ranges for full-time equivalent enrollments at its state-operated campuses.

1983-84	1984-85	1987-88	1992-93
165,000-168,500	164,500-170,000	164,000-171,000	162,500-172,500

Regents action: The Regents substitute the enrollment projections for State University they have set forth in the chapter on Enrollment Projections in Volume II of this Statewide Plan. For 1992-93, the head count enrollment projections provided by State University are between 28,000 and 30,000 students greater than the Regents projections for State-operated campuses in this Statewide Plan.

#15. The University estimates the following ranges for full-time equivalent enrollments at its community colleges:

1983-84	1984-85	1987-88	1992-93
129,800-136,600	129,200-137,200	126,500-135,700	125,800-136,300

Regents action: The Regents substitute the enrollment projections for State University they have set forth in the chapter on Enrollment Projections in Volume II of this Statewide Plan. For 1992-93, the head count enrollment projections for community colleges provided by State University appear to be between 20,000 and 23,000 students greater than the Regents projections for SUNY community colleges in this Statewide Plan.

Capital Facilities

Concerning capital construction, the plan states that during the expansion years in the late 1960's and early 1970's, the University's priorities were for increased academic and instructional capacity. Thus, a number of support facilities were deferred (library facilities, student activities, housing, recreation, and site work). Moreover, some "emerging campuses" still await completion of basic academic and support facilities (e.g., the Amherst and Main Street campuses of SUNY at Buffalo). Since 1980, SUNY has completed ten new academic buildings; 12 more are currently under construction; and nine are in the design stage. Furthermore, fiscal constraints have caused deferral of a great deal of maintenance and repair of aging physical plant, as well as modifications needed to provide access for the physically handicapped as required by Federal law. Capital support is also needed for replacement of academic and support equipment.

In this section, the plan includes the following five recommendations:

#16. The University will seek capital construction funds for facilities needed to make all campuses fully functional.

Regents action: No action taken. The Regents neither approve nor disapprove this recommendation. State University has the authority to include such requests in its annual budget requests. Those requests are re-

viewed and acted upon individually by the Division of the Budget.

#17. The University will continue to request a higher level of support for the maintenance, repair, and restoration of campus facilities.

Regents action: No action taken. The Regents neither approve nor disapprove this recommendation. State University has the authority to include such requests in its annual budget requests. Those requests are reviewed and acted upon individually by the Division of the Budget. However, the Regents commend and support State University's efforts to maintain its facilities.

#18. The University will seek support for appropriate modification of existing structures and will design and construct future facilities to accommodate the needs of the physically handicapped.

Regents action: No action taken. The Regents neither approve nor disapprove this recommendation. State University has the authority to include requests for this purpose in its annual budget requests. Those requests are reviewed and acted upon individually by the Division of the Budget. However, the Regents commend and support State University in its goal of accommodating the needs of the physically handicapped.

#19. The University will seek increased support to replace outdated equipment and install new equipment that is vital to is academic programs.

Regents action: No action taken. The Regents neither approve nor disapprove this recommendation. State University has the authority to include requests for this purpose in its annual budget requests. Those requests are reviewed and acted upon individually by the Division of the Budget. However, the Regents commend and support State University's efforts to assure that its campuses have up-to-date equipment.

#20. The University will continue to push for reduced energy consumption and increased energy efficiency at all campuses.

Regents action: Approved.

Fiscal Issues

This section states that low tuition is vital to the goal of wide access which is part of State University's mission. "While the University supports financial aid as a way to assist students in meeting their educational expenses, student aid must always be viewed as a supplement to and not a substitute for low tuition." The University urges that New York State continue to base tuition policy for public higher education on factors unique to its own situation, rather than attempting to tie its tuition levels to those of other states. Regarding the current enrollment-driven funding formulas, the plan notes that they were developed primarily to provide classroom instruction for full-time students. Thus, State University regards them as less adequate as part-time students and public service programs claim increasing shares of the University's resources. Moreover, formulas should recognize that fixed costs do not change proportionate to minor fluctuations in enrollments.

The following two recommendations are made in this section:

#21. The University is committed to low tuition.

Regents action: Defer. In this Statewide Plan, the Regents have urged the State University Trustees to "elaborate on its tuition policy by adopting a detailed statement of policy to guide the setting of tuition levels that includes criteria to guide the determination of those levels." The Regents defer action on this recommendation until such policy is adopted.

#22. The University in cooperation with state government will actively pursue new, improved, and more flexible funding formulas for public higher education.

Regents action: Approved.

Issues

The State University master plan also includes comments on a number of the key issues facing postsecondary education which are discussed in this Statewide Plan. These comments are summarized in the appropriate sections of Volume II of this Plan.

THE SUMMARY OF THE 1984 MASTER PLANS OF PROPRIETARY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS PREPARED BY THE ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Twenty-six of the State's 28 proprietary degree-granting institutions submitted 1984 master plans. The Association of Private Degree-Granting Institutions prepared a summary of these plans. This summary is outlined here as an indicator of the missions, goals, and plans of proprietary institutions. Their responses to the major issues facing all of postsecondary education are indicated in the appropriate chapters of Volume II of this Statewide Plan.

Mission

The summary of proprietary institutional master plans describes the general mission of proprietary institutions as career preparation in a setting which embodies the spirit of free enterprise. "The basic mission of the private degree-granting institutions is to provide a superior career education; one that prepares women and men to participate with intelligence and competence in professional, civic and social life." Such an education must be "responsive to student needs, business developments and a changing society."

Goals and Objectives

The summary states that all the proprietary institutions support the Regents goals of Excellence, Access, Diversity, and the Effective Use of Resources. Since 1980 the institutions have striven to integrate the four goals with the mission of career education. With regard to Excellence, the summary notes the institutions' stress on their students' development. Evidence of the success of this policy is the placement of more than 90 percent of graduates in employment directly related to their training. Curriculum planning goes hand-in-hand with career placement to keep academic programs current with student and employer needs. The majority of recently added programs are in the field of technology, with increasing emphasis on training in computer science and the use of computer-related equipment: word processing, office technology, data processing, and records management. Other major growth areas are business administration, accounting, management/marketing, health services, and travel/tourism. To further the goal of Excellence, a number of proprietary institutions will seek accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools or professional accrediting bodies. Other steps include additional opportunities for on-the-job training, expansion of cooperative education, and acquisition of state-of-the-art equipment.

In service of the goal of Access, according to the summary, a number of proprietary institutions are expanding branch campus operations and improving program articulation with secondary schools, colleges, and universities.

In connection with the Effective Use of Resources, the proprietary sector summary states that the institutions' development plans give evidence of control, direction, and the monitoring of needs and resources. Market studies by the institutions project steady or increased enrollment, allowing for planned growth and development.

The summary lists eight major goals of institutions in the proprietary sector, with objectives for achieving the goals. Specific strategies are listed for each objective; these are omitted here.

GOAL 1: To maintain and/or improve the academic excellence of curriculum.

- **Objective 1:** To study and evaluate the current academic offerings.
- **Objective 2:** To strengthen individual academic programs.
- **Objective 3:** To incorporate technology into the academic programs.

GOAL 2: To increase the percentage of student graduates.

- **Objective 1:** To improve the admissions policies and practices.
- **Objective 2:** To fully develop academic services.
- **Objective 3:** To meet the financial needs of all students.

GOAL 3: To improve the effectiveness of faculty.

- **Objective 1:** To provide opportunities for faculty development.
- **Objective 2:** To upgrade the conditions of employment.

Objective 3: To increase involvement in college affairs.

GOAL 4: To interrelate library resources and services with life long learning.

Objective 1: To increase library holdings.

Objective 2: To improve library instruction.

Objective 3: To develop learning center concept.

GOAL 5: To maintain and/or expand student enrollment.

Objective 1: To increase student enrollment.

Objective 2: To increase student access.

Objective 3: To improve student services

GOAL 6: To further develop articulation with all publics.

Objective 1: To strengthen the relationship with business and industry.

Objective 2: To further develop articulation with educational institutions.

Objective 3: To develop and implement interinstitutional cooperation.

GOAL 7: To maintain and/or improve the autonomy of all four sectors.

Objective 1: To support the Regents goal of diversity.

Objective 2: To strengthen the Association of Private Degree-Granting Institutions.

GOAL 8: To make effective use of resources.

Objective 1: To strengthen financial viability.

Objective 2: To maintain and/or improve physical plant.

Objective 3: To maintain and/or improve equipment.

Students

According to the summary, a high school diploma or an equivalency diploma is the common entrance requirement at proprietary institutions. The awarding of credit for applicable life experience or successful completion of "a college approved developmental program" is becoming more common. Most students commute; approximately 80 percent reside in the county where the institution is located or a nearby county. The age range of students is 17 to 65; the largest age group is between 20 and 30. Women number about 75 percent of total student population in the sector. Students' ethnic origins vary with campus location.

Enrollment

Twenty-four of the 28 proprietary institutions projected an increase in total undergraduate enrollment through 1987, then a slight decrease between 1987 and 1988, for a net increase of 15 percent between 1983 and 1988 (from 27,165 to 31,241 students). Part-time enrollment is projected to rise at a greater than full-time enrollment. In 1983, according to the summary, part-time undergraduates accounted for 23.8 percent of total undergraduate enrollment at the 24 institutions; by 1988 it is projected to make up 26.7 percent of the total. The summary states that not all institutions made projections for 1990 and 1992, rendering comparisons impossible.

Facilities

The summary states that the proprietary institutions generally plan to increase library services. Steps in this direction will include increasing collections, adding staff, building or enlarging facilities, and becoming members of regional loan systems. The continued upgrading of academic equipment is also a priority, according to the summary.

Recommendations

On behalf of the proprietary sector as a whole, the summary of institutional master plans makes 22 recommendations, ranged under the four Regents goals for postsecondary education. These recommendations are as follows:

A. EXCELLENCE. Nine recommendations are made:

1. That the Regents make no efforts to develop statewide measures applying to the evaluation of an institution's mission. Such measures would probably hinder or restrict institutional diversity.

   Regents action: Disapproved. The Regents agree that each institution, acting alone or (in the case of public sector institutions) in conjunction with the central administration, must define its own mission. However, according to Section 237 of the State's Education Law, it is the Regents responsibility to direct the master planning process. Since the mission of an insti-

tution is part of — indeed, the foundation of — its master plan, the Regents responsibility under the law includes the making of judgments concerning the institution's mission.

2. That the Regents reconsider the policy requiring all colleges to have a minimum number of volumes and other materials in their libraries. The location of the college and its proximity to and use of public library facilities should be taken into consideration.

   Regents action: No action taken. The Regents have not adopted a policy requiring specific collection sizes for postsecondary institutions. Rather, Commissioner's regulations require that the library be "sufficient in depth and breadth to support the mission of the institution and each registered curriculum."

3. That the Regents develop coordinated library services for all residents so there is easy access to information and library resources.

   Regents action: Approved. The Regents objectives for library development, established in their 1980 Statewide Plan, are continued by this current Plan. The Coordinated Collection Development Program, established by statute in 1981, is a significant step toward the accomplishment of these objectives.

4. That the Regents give high priority to the individual development of basic skills for all levels of education.

   Regents action: Approved.

5. That the Regents support career counseling programs focusing upon the improvement of basic skills as fundamental in all career endeavors.

   Regents action: Approved in principle. To determine the best means for offering such support requires further study.

6. That the Regents encourage educational programs that prepare teachers for business education specialties.

   Regents action: Approved in principle. The Regents encourage teacher education, particularly in present or projected shortage areas. These areas change from time to time. In 1982, business education was one of the specialties in which there were reports of problems in finding teachers.

7. That the Regents approve a rating system, perhaps a continuing education unit, for professional seminars and other activities for teacher preparation.

   Regents action: No action taken. No continuing education requirement currently exists for permanently certified teaching personnel in the public schools, nor is such a system as the one described in this recommendation an appropriate one for faculty at the postsecondary level.

8. That the Regents establish minimum academic standards for all postsecondary institutions that participate in Federal and State student financial aid programs.

   Regents action: No action taken. The requirement that programs offered by degree-granting institutions in New York State must be registered by the Department means that such minimum academic standards are now in place.

9. That the Regents encourage the colleges to employ adjunct faculty in academic disciplines projecting a teacher shortage.

   Regents action: No action taken. The colleges currently have the power to take this step in addressing this staffing problem.

B. ACCESS. Five recommendations are made:

1. That the Regents work for the approval of a student voucher system in order to provide students with a wider choice for attending postsecondary institutions.

   Regents action: No action taken. The steps taken and proposed by the Regents concerning student financial aid and its effect on choice are discussed elsewhere in this Statewide Plan. The optimum mix of student financial aid programs cannot be determined until studies have progressed well beyond their present stage.

2. That the Regents continue to support an increase in student financial aid programs, including both grants and loans in order to provide access to all postsecondary institutions.

   Regents action: Approved in principle. The amounts and forms of such increases, as recommended by the Regents, will continue to vary

from year to year depending upon a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

3. That the Regents encourage the establishment of a tuition policy in the public sector based upon student need and/or family income.

   Regents action: Disapproved. Elsewhere in the Plan, the Regents have called upon the public sectors to define more specifically their tuition policies. It is most appropriate for SUNY and CUNY to address this issue at this time without the restraints implied in this recommendation.

4. That the Regents establish a policy enabling students to transfer between institutions without the loss of academic credit.

   Regents action: Disapproved. The Regents urge institutions to eliminate barriers to student transfer. However, the amount of academic credit which it is appropriate for an accepting institution to approve varies, depending upon such factors as the degree of articulation between the student's lower-division and upper-division curricula. Institutions are encouraged to discuss articulation questions cooperatively in order to arrive at the best possible fit. A single overall policy is not appropriate.

5. That the Regents assist in the establishment of on-campus college work study programs.

   Regents action: Approved in principle. The Regents are currently considering their recommendations to the Congress regarding reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1985. The recommendations under consideration include the exemption of proprietary institutions duly authorized to grant degrees by the states in which they are located, from the ban on profit-making entities as placement sites for college work-study students.

C. DIVERSITY. Three recommendations are made:

1. That the Regents consider using the proprietary sector to provide educational programs to disadvantaged and non-traditional students rather than create new programs at institutions in the other sectors.

   Regents action: No action taken. Creation of programs is the function of the postsecondary institutions and the central administrations of the public sectors.

2. That the Regents encourage improvement in the articulation efforts among all degree-granting institutions in the State.

   Regents action: Approved. This is current Regents policy.

3. That the Regents promote legislation that will permit an out-of-state student who is enrolled in a New York postsecondary institution to be eligible for a TAP award.

   Regents action: Disapproved. Given the necessary limitations on State funding for student financial aid, the Regents judge that it is in the best interests of the State and its citizens to limit eligibility for TAP and other State-supported assistance to residents of New York State. The burdens of establishing New York residence for TAP purposes are uniform and rigorous, but not onerous.

D. EFFECTIVE USE OF RESOURCES. Five recommendations are made:

1. That by 1986, the Regents, the Department of Commerce and the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York develop and implement a coordinated "I Love New York Colleges" campaign to bring to postsecondary students, both in New York and out of state, information about the strength, diversity and uniqueness of higher education in New York.

   Regents action: Approved in principle. In order for this recommendation to be implemented, consultation will be necessary among the State Education and Commerce departments and ACUSNY.

2. That the Regents convince the Legislature to approve the TAP for part- time students.

   Regents action: Approved. A measure to make certain part-time undergraduates eligible to receive assistance was approved by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor in 1984.

3. That the Regents introduce legislation to allow proprietary institutions to participate in PASS

accounts and other income tax credit programs.

Regents action: Approved.

4. That the Regents encourage all libraries that are members of the 3R's program to actively participate in regional interlibrary loan programs.

Regents action: Approved.

5. That the Regents consider the establishment of minimal day care requirements for colleges who are interested in offering child care services for their students only.

Regents action: Disapproved. The State Department of Social Services, rather than the Regents, establishes regulations governing day care centers.